

SEDAP

A PROGRAM FOR RESEARCH ON

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DIMENSIONS OF AN AGING POPULATION

**Exploring the Returns to Scale in Food Preparation
(Baking Penny Buns at Home)**

Thomas F. Crossley and Yuqian Lu

SEDAP Research Paper No. 121

For further information about SEDAP and other papers in this series, see our web site:
<http://socserv2.mcmaster.ca/sedap>

Requests for further information may be addressed to:
Secretary, SEDAP Research Program
Kenneth Taylor Hall, Room 426
McMaster University
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada
L8S 4M4
FAX: 905 521 8232
e-mail: qsep@mcmaster.ca

**Exploring the Returns to Scale in Food Preparation
(Baking Penny Buns at Home)**

Thomas F. Crossley and Yuqian Lu

SEDAP Research Paper No. 121

October 2004

The Program for Research on Social and Economic Dimensions of an Aging Population (SEDAP) is an interdisciplinary research program centred at McMaster University with participants at the University of British Columbia, Queen's University, Université de Montréal, and the University of Toronto. It has support from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada under the Major Collaborative Research Initiatives Program, and further support from Statistics Canada, the Canadian Institute for Health Information, and participating universities. The SEDAP Research Paper series provides a vehicle for distributing the results of studies undertaken by those associated with the program. Authors take full responsibility for all expressions of opinion.

Exploring the Returns to Scale in Food Preparation (Baking Penny Buns at Home)

Thomas F. Crossley and Yuqian Lu

Department of Economics
and
Social and Economic Dimensions of an Aging Population Research Program,
McMaster University*

September 2004

Abstract: We show that as household size increases, households substitute away from prepared foods and towards ingredients. They also devote more time to food preparation. These observations (1) are consistent with a simple model with home production, returns to scale in the time input to food preparation, and varieties of food that differ in the required time input; (2) support the idea that returns to scale in home production are an important source of returns to scale in consumption; and (3), mean that across household sizes, household market expenditures on food are not proportional to food consumption quantities. The latter may provide a partial explanation for a puzzle raised by Deaton and Paxson.

Keywords: Household returns to scale, home production, food preparation

JEL classification: D11, D12, D13

* Author order is alphabetical. The authors gratefully acknowledge the support of the Social and Economic Dimensions of an Aging Population (SEDAP) Research Program at McMaster University and the Arts Research Board of McMaster University. SEDAP is primarily funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) and also receives substantial additional support from Statistics Canada. Correspondence: Thomas Crossley, Department of Economics, McMaster University, Kenneth Taylor Hall, Hamilton, Canada, L8S 4M4. crossle@mcmaster.ca.

1. Introduction

The idea that “two can live more cheaply than one” (Deaton, 1997) is not controversial. However, understanding the nature and magnitude of returns to scale in household consumption is important for large number of questions in applied economics. These include: How should social benefits vary with household size? What is the appropriate amount of life insurance for each member of a couple? How can we compare the incidence of poverty across groups that live in households of different sizes?

Returns to scale in consumption are often associated with public goods within the household (housing being an obvious example.) However, since Becker (1965), economists have understood that many goods may be purchased not for direct consumption, but rather for combination with time in the home production of the goods and services that are ultimately consumed. It is plausible that home production is an important source of returns to scale in household consumption. In this note we explore this idea by focusing on a particular example: food preparation. If there are important returns to scale in home production (in addition to public goods such as housing), then documenting those will be important for the types of questions outlined above.

In addition, our analysis is close related to an important puzzle in understanding returns to scale in household consumption posed by Deaton and Paxson (1998). They suggest that, holding per capita resources constant, returns to scale (in at least some goods) imply that larger households are better off, and so should consume more of personal goods such as food. However, they document in a range of data sets that larger households have lower per capita food expenditures (holding per capita resources constant). Gan and Vernon (2003) suggest that returns to scale in food

consumption – particularly in food preparation – may resolve this puzzle. However, Deaton and Paxson (2003) emphasize that returns to scale in food preparation strengthen rather than resolve their puzzle.

The latter assertion is true of models in which “food” is a single commodity, or at least homogeneous with respect to preparation time. In contrast, if food is a composite of goods that differ in their preparation times, returns to scale in food preparation are a potential explanation of the Deaton-Paxson Puzzle. Deaton and Paxson recognize this possibility in their original paper, but do not consider it a likely explanation (Deaton and Paxson, 1998, pg. 922). The slightly richer model that we present in this note retains the Barten – type demographic effects of Deaton and Paxson’s analysis but adds explicit home production (of food) and two types of food (which differ in their preparation times). Thus it serves to illustrate the case in which returns to scale in food preparation might explain the Deaton and Paxson Puzzle, and to contrast with the case in which food is homogeneous with respect to time costs.

The second contribution of this note is to examine some of the predictions of our richer model using detailed data from detailed food expenditure diaries and from detailed time use diaries. We find evidence supporting key predictions of our model. There do seem to be returns to scale in food preparation, and these lead to substantial substitutions across types of food as household size increases.

With respect to the Deaton-Paxson puzzle, we find that a version of the puzzle remains. However, we argue that the type of test for returns to scale that Deaton and Paxson propose may be difficult to implement (at least for developed countries) because of substitutions *within* broad food categories.

The rest of this note is organized as follows. In the next section we review the puzzle posed by Deaton and Paxson, and the implications of adding home production

to their model while maintaining the assumption that food is a homogeneous good. In Section 3, we contrast this analysis with a model with two types of food that differ in their preparation times. Section 4 presents our empirical analysis. Section 5 provides a concluding discussion.

2. The Deaton-Paxson Puzzle

2.1 The Basic Puzzle

Consider a household with n members (adults only) who enjoy two goods: a private good f (food) and a composite of other goods x which is subject to some scale economies. To focus on returns to scale, we follow Deaton and Paxson (1998) in assuming a unitary model of household preferences.¹ The household's problem is:

$$\begin{aligned} \max n u\left(\frac{f}{n}, \frac{x}{n^\theta}\right) \quad & 0 < \theta < 1 \\ \text{st. } p_f \frac{f}{n} + p_x \frac{x}{n} &= \frac{y}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

The expression n^θ captures returns to scale in the (composite) good x . When $n = 1$, $n^\theta = 1^\theta = 1$; when $n = 2$, $n^\theta = 2^\theta < 2$, and so on.² The p_i are market prices and y is household income (or total expenditure).

Note that the budget constraint can be rewritten in terms of individual consumption, per capita income, and *shadow* prices:

$$p_f^* f^* + p_x^* x^* = y^*,$$

¹ For an analysis combining returns to scale with a collective model of household preferences see Browning, Chiappori and Lewbel (2003).

² Deaton and Paxson (1998) (and Gan and Vernon, 2003) assume a more general form for the returns to scale $(\frac{x}{\phi(n)})$. Note however that we restrict our empirical analysis to singles and couples. With just two household sizes, a simple technology is completely general (even a linear technology would do).

where $y^* = \frac{y}{n}$, $f^* = \frac{f}{n}$, $x^* = \frac{x}{n^\theta}$,

and $p_f^* = p_f$, $p_x^* = p_x = \frac{p_x}{n^{1-\theta}}$.

The key insight of Barten-type models (Barten, 1964) is that demographics have price-like effects. Here, as household size increases, the price of the private good (food) is unaffected,³ but the resource cost (shadow price) of the good subject to

returns to scale (x^*) falls: $\frac{\partial p_x^*}{\partial n} < 0$. This will have both income and substitution

effects, as follows:

		f^*	x^*
	IE	↑	↑
	SE	↓ (but small?)	↑
	TE	↑ (?)	↑
Data:	observed	not observed	

As n increases, x^* (individual consumption of x) should unambiguously rise.

However, note that x^* is not observed by the econometrician, as it depends on the

returns to scale parameter θ . In contrast, individual food consumption, f^* , is

observed (as it depends only on total food and household size.) The income and

substitution effects for food have opposite sign, but Deaton and Paxson posit that

since there are few substitutes for food, the income effect should dominate.⁴ Thus,

holding resources (income or total outlay) per capita constant, larger households

should have higher per capita consumption of food and, given common market prices,

higher per capita food expenditures.

³ Gorman (1976) famously wrote “When you have a wife and baby, a penny bun costs three pence.”

⁴ Deaton and Paxson note that this is particularly likely to be true in developing countries, and include such countries in their empirical analysis. Of course, for the case of no substitution effect, the utility function must be Leontief: $n^* \min \left[\frac{f}{n}, \frac{x}{n^\theta} \right]$.

Deaton and Paxson examine expenditure data from a range of countries and find the opposite result: larger households have lower per capita food expenditures holding per capita income constant. They consider and reject a number of possible explanations for this puzzle.

2.2 Food Preparation with Homogeneous Time Costs

Beside food, Deaton and Paxson also examine household expenditures on some other private goods. They find that “the coefficients on household size are generally positive for clothing and entertainment”⁵, which implies that food has different characters from other private goods. Gan and Vernon (2003) suggest that returns to scale in food consumption would help resolve the puzzle and speculate that returns to scale in the time cost of food preparation might be the source of returns to scale in food consumption. Deaton and Paxson (2003) respond that returns to scale in food consumption could certainly help to explain the puzzle but note that returns to scale in the time required for food preparation actually deepen, rather than resolve, the puzzle. To see why, consider the following simple extension to the model, adding home production (of food):

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \max nu\left(\frac{f}{n}, \frac{x}{n^\theta}, \frac{l}{n}\right) \\
 & s.t.: \quad \frac{f}{n} = \min\left[\frac{t}{n^\gamma}, \frac{i}{n}\right] \\
 & \quad w\left(\frac{T}{n} - \frac{l}{n} - \frac{t}{n}\right) = p_x \frac{x}{n} + p_i \frac{i}{n} \\
 & \quad 0 < \theta < 1, \quad 0 < \gamma < 1
 \end{aligned}$$

⁵ Deaton and Paxson find mixed results for alcohol and tobacco. These are goods for which it is quite plausible to assume that preferences change with household size (particularly co-habitation). Using data from the Canada Family Expenditure Survey 1992 and 1996, we find a positive but insignificant effect of household size (among singles and couples, and as always holding per capita income constant) for clothing, and a negative effect for alcohol and tobacco (significant only for the former).

where i is quantity of ingredients purchased, t is time spent on food preparation, and l is leisure time. The production function implies:

$$t = \frac{i}{n^{1-\gamma}}$$

and:

$$f = i$$

so that the problem can be rewritten:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & nu\left(\frac{i}{n}, \frac{x}{n^\theta}, \frac{l}{n}\right) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & w\frac{T}{n} = p_x \frac{x}{n} + p_i \frac{i}{n} + w\frac{l}{n} + w\frac{i}{n} \left(\frac{1}{n^{1-\gamma}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

As before the budget constraint rewritten in terms of individual consumption, per capita income (now full income), and shadow prices:

$$wT^* = p_x^* x^* + w l^* + p_i^* i^*,$$

where

$$i^* = \frac{i}{n}, \quad l^* = \frac{l}{n}, \quad x^* = \frac{x}{n^\theta},$$

and

$$p_i^* = p_i + \frac{w}{n^{1-\gamma}}, \quad p_x^* = \frac{p_x}{n^{1-\theta}}.$$

Now the shadow prices (full costs) of both food and other goods (x^*) fall with household size, leading to larger income effects. Moreover, the direction of substitution effects, if any, depend on the relative size of the returns to scale parameters θ and γ , and could favour food. As household size increases (holding resources per capita constant), per capita food consumption – and hence per capita

quantities of ingredients purchased – should increase. As Deaton and Paxson note, budget data record *market* expenditures on ingredients (food). That is, they record $p_i i$, not the full cost, $p_i^* i$. However, this is actually useful because (assuming common market prices) market expenditures are proportional to quantities, so per capita market expenditures should rise with household size (holding per capita resources constant). Thus the Deaton-Paxson puzzle remains – and is deepened because income effects should be greater here than in the simpler model.

3. Food Preparation with Heterogeneous Time Costs

Models in which foods differ in their time cost have quite different implications. The simplest model that illustrates this point assumes that there are just two kinds of food, with the most extreme heterogeneity in time costs of preparation. Prepared or “cooked” food, c is purchased “ready-to-eat” and requires no preparation time. Alternatively, ingredients i can be purchased and combined with time to produce regular food, r . We assume the same home production technology is as in the model of the previous section. We do not assume that prepared food and home cooking are perfect substitutes. Thus in this model the household’s problem is:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & nu\left(\frac{f}{n}, \frac{x}{n^\theta}, \frac{l}{n}\right) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \frac{w(T-l-t)}{n} = p_c \frac{c}{n} + p_i \frac{i}{n} + p_x \frac{x}{n} \\ & \frac{f}{n} = f\left(\frac{r}{n}, \frac{c}{n}\right) \\ & \frac{r}{n} = \min\left[\frac{t}{n^\gamma}, \frac{i}{n}\right] \end{aligned}$$

The production function implies $t = \frac{i}{n^{1-\gamma}}$ and $r = i$. Thus the problem can be written:

$$\begin{aligned} \max & \nu(f(c^*, i^*), x^*, l^*) \\ \text{s.t.} & wT^* = p_x^* x^* + wl^* + p_i^* i^* + p_c c^* \end{aligned}$$

where

$$c^* = \frac{c}{n}, \quad i^* = \frac{i}{n}, \quad l^* = \frac{l}{n}, \quad x^* = \frac{x}{n^\theta},$$

and

$$p_i^* = p_i + \frac{w}{n^{1-\gamma}}, \quad p_x^* = \frac{p_x}{n^{1-\theta}}.$$

When household size increases, the shadow prices of ingredients (regular food), $i^* (= r^*)$, and other goods, x^* , fall. We follow Deaton and Paxson in assuming that substitution effects between food and other goods are negligible (so the change in p_x^* affects food purchases only through income effects). The income and substitution effects on food purchased can be summarized as follows:

	c^*	i^*
IE	↑	↑
SE	↓	↑
TE	?	↑

There are three key predictions. First, as household size increases there should be a substitution from ready-to-eat or prepared foods towards ingredients. This is important because it means that, across household size, (per capita) market expenditures on all foods are not proportional to (per capita) food quantities. Market expenditures (per capita) are:

$$p_c \frac{c}{n} + p_i \frac{i}{n}$$

If $p_i < p_c$ (as seems reasonable) then substitution from c to i could lead market expenditures to fall, even if per capita quantities of food were constant or rising. Thus

this kind of compositional effect could explain the Deaton-Paxson puzzle. Another way to think about this point is that in this model, the “market price” of food (which in this model is a weighted average) is not constant across household sizes, because households of different size purchase different food baskets. Thus broad expenditure patterns across household sizes are not necessarily informative about quantity patterns.

The second key prediction is that in this model, per capita quantities of the most time intensive food should rise with household size (holding per capita resources constant). This is because of both income and substitution effects. This prediction is in some sense the analogue of the prediction that Deaton and Paxson examine in their original (1998) paper.

Finally, we can use the production condition $\left(t = \frac{i}{n^{1-\gamma}} \right)$ to eliminate

ingredients rather than preparation time. This leads to an unambiguous prediction that

$t^* = \frac{t}{n^\gamma}$ should rise with household size. Of course, t^* is not observed in the data

because (except for singles) it depends on the return of scale parameter γ . Only t (or

$\frac{t}{n}$) is observed. However, note that if returns to scale are operating ($0 < \gamma < 1$) and

per capita time ($\frac{t}{n}$) rises with household size, then *effective* time per capita ($t^* = \frac{t}{n^\gamma}$)

must rise with household size because $\frac{t}{n^\gamma} > \frac{t}{n}$ when $n \geq 2$. Thus the observation that

per capita time spent on food preparation rises with household size would support the

model (and suggest quite large returns to scale).⁶ We now turn to an empirical

examination of the predictions of our model.

⁶ If course, this also means lower per capita time expenditures would not necessarily contradict the model, as this observation could be consistent with increasing effective time per person.

4. Empirical Evidence

To investigate the empirical relevance of the model described in the previous section, we employ two cross-sectional data sources. The first is the 1992 and 1996 Canadian Food Expenditure Survey (FOODEX), a detailed two week diary of household food expenditures, which distinguishes several hundred types of food purchased from stores. We have divided those types of foods into ‘ingredients’ (foods requiring substantial preparation) and prepared or “ready-to-eat” foods.⁷ The second data set is the detailed time use diaries that are part of the 1996 Canadian General Social Survey (GSS), and in particular the information on time spent on food preparation in that data.

In our empirical analysis we focus on singles and couples (without children), and further restrict the sample to individuals aged 25-55 and working full time (ie., both members of a couple must satisfy these criteria for the household to be included). Our FOODEX sample contains 1188 singles and 945 couple households. The GSS sample includes 1196 singles and 1163 couple households.

We focus on fully employed singles and couples because we believe it gives the cleanest focus on returns to scale. Moreover, as explained below, the limitations of our data make it convenient to focus on households with small labour supply elasticities. A downside of this choice is that when they compare households of size 1 and 2 only, Deaton and Paxson do not find their puzzle in all the countries they consider.⁸ However, we will demonstrate below that the Deaton - Paxson puzzle is evident in our sample.

⁷ Prepared foods include cooked meats; canned meats, stews and soups; frozen precooked fish; canned pasta products; baked beans; pre-cooked meat or poultry pies; pre-cooked frozen dinners; other pre-cooked food preparations.

⁸ See Table 2 of Deaton and Paxson (1998).

In both data sets there are slightly more men than women among singles. In all our calculations, we use weights to undo this discrepancy (so that there is no difference in “average” gender between the couples and singles.)⁹

We examine the expenditure patterns in the FOODEX data with both nonparametric and parametric (OLS) regressions. The former relate shares and ratios of expenditures to income per capita. The latter in addition condition on the age, gender and education of the household head, as well as seasonal and regional dummies. We condition on total market income, rather than full income (as our extended model with home production would suggest is appropriate), because neither data set contains information on wages.¹⁰ The assumption that maps our theory into our empirical work is that for these samples (young, childless, singles and couples, working full time) labour supply elasticities are very small (so that we can treat market income as essentially exogenous.) We believe that for this sample, this is a reasonable assumption.

We begin by examining food shares by per capital income for singles and couples. Nonparametric regression estimates are presented in Figure 1 and parametric regression estimates in the first column of Table 1. Figure 1 shows that every level of per capita income, couples have lower food budget shares, and hence lower food expenditure (holding per capita income constant, a lower share implies lower expenditure.) The confidence intervals displayed in Figure 1 indicate that the differences are not statistically significant. However, with a parametric specification, the estimated shares of couples are not only lower but the difference from singles is

⁹ In practice, this correction makes no difference to our results.

¹⁰ Deaton and Paxson (1998) condition on per capita expenditure, and then instrument this quantity with cash income, which is assumed to be exogenous.

statistically significant (the coefficient on the couple dummy in Column 1 of Table 1.)

Thus the Deaton and Paxson puzzle is apparent in our data.

We now turn to an analysis of prepared foods and ingredients. Figure 2 displays the estimated nonparametric curves for the ratio of prepared foods to ingredients. Holding per capita resources constant, food expenditures of couple households are significantly shifted towards ingredients (and away from prepared foods). Confidence intervals suggest the difference between the two curves is also statistically significant at most income levels. A parametric regression analysis reveals the same pattern (Column 2 of Table 1), and the difference between couples and singles is statistically significant. These are the substitution patterns within food predicted by our extended model.

In addition to prepared food purchased for consumption at home, we also examine expenditures on take-out fast-food. Take-out fast-food can be considered food at home with little preparation time (perhaps even less than the prepared foods purchased in stores).¹¹ Figure 3, and column 3 of Table 1, illustrate that, holding per capita resources constant, food expenditures of couple households are significantly shifted away from fast-food and towards ingredients, which is again consistent with our first prediction.

These types of substitutions suggest substantial returns to scale in food preparation. They also mean that food at home is not a homogeneous commodity, and that across household sizes, expenditures may not be proportional to household sizes. If larger households are substituting towards foods that are cheaper on the market but require greater time inputs, then market expenditures could fall, while quantities do not fall, or even rise.

¹¹ In contrast, meals eaten in restaurants may comprise a bundle of different services, including entertainment.

Some evidence on this is provided in Table 2, which focuses on meat purchase in particular. The FOODEX data collects both expenditures and quantities, so that we can examine quantities directly. We can also calculate unit values, which are expenditure divided by quantity – similar to a price.¹²

The bottom panel of Table 2 shows that, for both singles and couples, the average unit value (\$ per kg) of prepared meat is higher than for unprepared meat (an ingredient) – by about 25%. These differences are both economically and statistically significant. The top panel of Table 2 shows the consequence of these differences in average unit values. The difference in per capita expenditures on meat between singles and couples is larger than the difference in per capita quantities, and the latter difference is not statistically significant at traditional levels of significance. Note, however, that the per capita quantity of meat does not rise with household size, a point we return to below.

Another key prediction of our extended model is that per capita quantities of the most time intensive good – in our case ingredients – should rise with household size (holding per capita income constant). This is because of both the income and substitution effects of the changes in shadow prices brought about by increasing household size. Assuming that market prices are constant, this means that, at a given level of per capita resources, couple households should spend a larger share of their budget of their budget on ingredients. This is not what we observe in our data. Figure 4 and column 4 of Table 3 show that, if anything, couples spend a lower share of their budget on ingredients. Thus a version of the Deaton and Paxson puzzle remains.

¹² Unit values are not quite a price, because variation in unit values can reflect, for example, variation in quality. See Deaton (1997) for further discussion.

Of course, this observation can be explained by the same argument that we have applied to total food expenditures. ‘Ingredients’ in turn are a composite good comprising many types of food with different preparation times, and substitutions between them mean that market expenditures on ingredients are not proportional to quantities. Larger families may pay a lower ‘average’ price because of such compositional effects. However, it is difficult to provide affirmative evidence of this hypothesis (largely because it is not clear what further dis-aggregation of food expenditures would be most appropriate.) One suggestive piece of evidence can be found in the bottom panel of Table 2. The average observed unit value of unprepared meat is lower for couples than for singles, and this difference is statistically significant. This means that expenditures are not necessarily proportional to quantities (across household sizes) even at this level of dis-aggregation.

Our extended model can be solved for the time input rather than ingredients, and gives the unambiguous prediction that *effective* time per person on food preparation should rise with household size. A potential empirical problem is that *effective* time is not observed (as it depends on the returns to scale parameter). Nevertheless, Table 1 summarizes food preparation times from the 1998 GSS Time Use Survey.¹³ The key point is that couples spend more time *per person* on food preparation than singles (32 min vs. 26 min per person for daily meal preparation, i.e. the household food preparation time of couples is more than double the food preparation time of singles). As noted above, if per capita time rises moving from singles to couples, then *effective* time must also rise. Thus the time use data are

¹³ Unfortunately, the GSS time use survey only reports household income in categories, precluding the possibility of conditioning on per capita income as we did in the food data.

consistent with the predictions of our model, and suggest significant returns to scale in food preparation.

5. Discussion

In this note we have explored the intuitive idea that returns to scale in home production are an important source of returns to scale in consumption. We focused on food preparation. Substantial returns to scale in home production would have implications for a number of applied economic questions. Returns to scale in food preparation in particular would challenge the common view that food can be considered a “private good.” The model we present in this note also illustrates how such returns to scale can provide a solution to an important puzzle posed Deaton and Paxson (1998). As Deaton and Paxson have suggested, this requires that foods are heterogeneous with respect to time costs (as they are in our model). In models such as ours, substitution between foods that differ in preparation times and market prices means that market expenditures are not proportional to quantities. Thus there can be a compositional effect: larger families may consume larger quantities of food while spending less (in the market) because their food basket is shifted towards ingredients that have lower market prices (but require greater time inputs.)

We have examined several types of evidence to determine whether households behave in this way. On the positive side, it there seems to be good evidence for returns to scale in food preparation and heterogeneity within food with respect to time costs.

First, using detailed food expenditure data we show that larger households’ food baskets are significantly shifted away from prepared and ready-to-eat foods and towards foods requiring preparation time (‘ingredients’). Second, we provide

evidence from time use data that *per capita* food preparation time is significantly greater for working couples than for working singles.

However, we are ultimately left with a version of the original Deaton and Paxson puzzle. In our extended model with two kinds of foods, market expenditures on the more time intensive type of food should increase with household size, holding per capita resources constant. That is, in our richer model (with heterogeneous preparation times), Deaton and Paxson's original assertion that returns to scale in time costs deepen their puzzle applies to the most time intensive food. However, in our data, market expenditures on 'ingredients' do not increase with household size (holding per capita resources constant.)

Of course, this observation can be explained by the same argument that we have applied to total food expenditures: 'Ingredients' in turn are a composite good comprising many types of food with different preparation times, and substitutions between them mean that market expenditures on ingredients are not proportional to quantities. Larger families may pay a lower 'average' price because of such compositional effects. If such substitution patterns are important at finer levels of disaggregation, the Deaton and Paxson's strategy for testing for returns to scale may be very difficult to implement.

With respect to the Deaton-Paxson puzzle, an extremely important caveat to our analysis is that the kinds of substitution patterns we have identified (between prepared foods and ingredients, or more generally, between foods with different preparation times) may well be much less important in developing countries, or among those living at subsistence levels. Evidence from developing countries was an important part of Deaton and Paxson's original empirical analysis.

We would also emphasize that our analysis in no way revives “Engel’s second law” (or “Engel’s assertion”), or the methods of determining equivalence scales that are based upon it. This assertion states that households of different size with the same food (market) expenditure share have the same welfare level. The problems with this assertion have been well described by Deaton (1997) and by Deaton and Paxson (2003). Our demonstration that differences in budget shares across households of different sizes are not proportional to differences in food quantities makes the Engel method seem even more arbitrary.

More generally, our results suggest that the identification strategies (in the estimation collective household models, for example) that rest on food being a “private good” may be problematic. Across households of different sizes, the total quantity of food consumed is not proportional to observed (market) expenditures.

Finally, we think our analysis suggests that a full understanding of returns to scale in household consumption will require modeling that includes two features. The first is home production (such as the time costs of food preparation). In this respect our analysis echoes a number of recent papers that propose home production as the resolution of consumption puzzles (for example, Apps and Rees, 2001, and Aguiar and Hurst, 2004). The second is careful consideration of the characteristics of the many goods that households purchase (such as differences in the time inputs they require.) The kinds of substitution patterns we have documented suggest that working with highly aggregated expenditure categories (such as ‘food’) may mask important ways in which returns to scale operate, or indeed, the ways in which households optimize.

References

- Aguiar, M., and Hurst, E., (2004), "Consumption vs. Expenditure", NBER Working Paper No. w10307.
- Apps, P., and Rees, R., (2001), "Household saving and Full Consumption over the Life Cycle", IZA Discussion paper no. 428.
- Barten, A.P., (1964), "Family Composition, Prices, and Expenditure Patterns," in *Econometric Analysis for National Economic Planning: 16th Symposium of the Colston Society*, P. Hart, G. Mills and J.K. Whitaker, eds., 277-292, London: Butterworth.
- Becker, G.S., (1965), "A Theory of the Allocation of Time." *Economic Journal*, 75:493-517.
- Browning, M., Chiappori P.-A., and Lewbel, A., (2003), "Estimating Consumption Economies of Scale, Adult Equivalence Scales and Household Bargaining Power." Working Paper 2003-12, Centre for Applied Microeconometrics, Institute of Economics, University of Copenhagen.
- Deaton, A., (1997). *The Analysis of Household Surveys: A Microeconomic Approach to Development Policy*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Deaton, A., and Paxson, C., (1998), "Economies of Scale, Household Size, and the Demand for Food." *Journal of Political Economy* 106(5):897-930.
- Deaton, A., and Paxson, C., (2003), "Engel's What? A Response to Gan and Vernon." *Journal of Political Economy* 111(6):1378-1381.
- Gan, L., and Vernon, V., (2003), "Economies of Scale, Household Size, and the Demand for Food." *Journal of Political Economy* 111(6):1361-1377.
- Gorman, W., (1976), "Tricks with Utility Functions." In M.J. Artis and A.R. Nobay (eds.), *Essays in Economic Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tables and Figures

Table 1: Food Regressions

	Food (purchased from store) budget share	Ratio of prepared food to ingredients	Ratio of take- out fast-food to ingredients	Ingredients budget share
	Regression Coefficients x100, [t-statistics in square parentheses]			
Couple Dummy	-1.03 [-3.80]	-10.04 [-3.99]	-10.91 [-3.34]	-0.67 [-2.91]
ln (per capita income)	-8.94 [-6.11]	-1.10 [-0.38]	8.39 [2.60]	-7.21 [-6.22]
R²	0.31	0.029	0.025	0.29
Notes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on a pooled sample of 1188 singles and 945 childless couples from the 1992 and 1996 Canadian Food Expenditure Surveys. All members are aged 25-55 and working full time. In all calculations the data are weighted to equalize the proportion of each gender amongst singles. 2. Additional regressions controls include age, sex, education of the household head, as well as season and region dummies. Including quadratic term of logistic per capita income has little impact on the coefficient of couple dummy. Full results are available from the authors 				

Table 2: Meat Purchases

		Singles	Couples	t-test of equality
Mean Weekly Purchases (standard errors in parentheses)				
Unprepared	<i>\$ per capita</i>	9.2 (0.34)	8.5 (0.30)	[-1.66]
	<i>kgs per capita</i>	1.7 (0.07)	1.7 (0.08)	[-0.02]
Prepared	<i>\$ per capita</i>	3.6 (0.13)	2.7 (0.11)	[-4.92]
	<i>kgs per capita</i>	0.5 (0.02)	0.4 (0.02)	[-5.50]
	<i>share in total meat (\$)</i>	0.36 (0.01)	0.30 (0.01)	[-4.09]
	<i>share in total meat (kgs)</i>	0.35 (0.01)	0.28 (0.01)	[-4.63]
Total meat	<i>\$ per capita</i>	12.8 (0.36)	11.2 (0.33)	[-3.26]
	<i>kgs per capita</i>	2.2 (0.07)	2.0 (0.08)	[-1.42]
Mean Unit Values (\$/kg, standard errors in parentheses)				
Unprepared		6.6 (0.10)	6.3 (0.09)	[-2.01]
Prepared		8.1 (0.16)	8.3 (0.15)	[0.84]
t-test of equality		[7.9]	[11.0]	
Notes: 1. Based on a pooled sample of 1188 singles and 945 childless couples from the 1992 and 1996 Canadian Food Expenditure Surveys. All members are aged 25-55 and working full time. The data are weighted to equalize the proportion of each gender amongst singles.				

Footnote f or text: not a function of outliers. Test of equality of median is rejected with t statistics of 4.7 and 8.9 for singles and couples.

Table 3: *Per capita* time spent on food preparation

	Single household	Couple household	
	Means, minutes per day (Standard errors are in parentheses)		t-test of equality
Food Preparation and cleanup	40.7 (1.49)	47.6 (2.29)	[3.02]
Food Preparation (shopping plus meal preparation)	35.6 (1.32)	39.9 (2.00)	[2.15]
Meal preparation	26.4 (1.03)	32.0 (2.68)	[3.16]
Grocery shopping	9.1 (0.75)	8.0 (0.93)	[-0.93]
Notes: 1. Based on a sample of 861 singles and 550 childless couples from the 1996 Canadian General Social Survey. All members are aged 25-55 and working full time. The data are weighted to equalize the proportion of each gender amongst singles.			

Figure 1. Nonparametric curves and confidence intervals
food at home budget share




Figure 2. Nonparametric curves and confidence intervals,
expenditure ratio of prepared food to ingredients




Figure 3. Nonparametric curves and confidence intervals,
expenditure ratio of take-out food to ingredients





Figure 4. Nonparametric curves and confidence intervals,
Ingredients budget share



Number	Title	Author(s)
No. 1:	Population Aging and Its Economic Costs: A Survey of the Issues and Evidence	F.T. Denton B.G. Spencer
No. 2:	How Much Help Is Exchanged in Families? Towards an Understanding of Discrepant Research Findings	C.J. Rosenthal L.O. Stone
No. 3:	Did Tax Flattening Affect RRSP Contributions?	M.R. Veall
No. 4:	Families as Care-Providers Versus Care-Managers? Gender and Type of Care in a Sample of Employed Canadians	C.J. Rosenthal A. Martin-Matthews
No. 5:	Alternatives for Raising Living Standards	W. Scarth
No. 6:	Transitions to Retirement: Determinants of Age of Social Security Take Up	E. Tompa
No. 7:	Health and Individual and Community Characteristics: A Research Protocol	F. Béland S. Birch G. Stoddart
No. 8:	Disability Related Sources of Income and Expenses: An Examination Among the Elderly in Canada	P. Raina S. Dukeshire M. Denton L.W. Chambers A. Scanlan A. Gafni S. French A. Joshi C. Rosenthal
No. 9:	The Impact of Rising 401(k) Pension Coverage on Future Pension Income	W.E. Even D.A. Macpherson
No. 10:	Income Inequality as a Canadian Cohort Ages: An Analysis of the Later Life Course	S.G. Prus
No. 11:	Are Theories of Aging Important? Models and Explanations in Gerontology at the Turn of the Century	V.L. Bengtson C.J. Rice M.L. Johnson
No. 12:	Generational Equity and the Reformulation of Retirement	M.L. Johnson
No. 13:	Long-term Care in Turmoil	M.L. Johnson L. Cullen D. Patsios
No. 14:	The Effects of Population Ageing on the Canadian Health Care System	M.W. Rosenberg

Number	Title	Author(s)
No. 15:	Projections of the Population and Labour Force to 2046: Canada	F.T. Denton C.H. Feaver B.G. Spencer
No. 16:	Projections of the Population and Labour Force to 2046: The Provinces and Territories	F.T. Denton C.H. Feaver B.G. Spencer
No. 17:	Location of Adult Children as an Attraction for Black and White Elderly Migrants in the United States	K.-L. Liaw W.H. Frey J.-P. Lin
No. 18:	The Nature of Support from Adult <i>Sansei</i> (Third Generation) Children to Older <i>Nisei</i> (Second Generation) Parents in Japanese Canadian Families	K.M. Kobayashi
No. 19:	The Effects of Drug Subsidies on Out-of-Pocket Prescription Drug Expenditures by Seniors: Regional Evidence from Canada	T.F. Crossley P. Grootendorst S. Korkmaz M.R. Veall
No. 20:	Describing Disability among High and Low Income Status Older Adults in Canada	P. Raina M. Wong L.W. Chambers M. Denton A. Gafni
No. 21:	Parental Illness and the Labour Supply of Adult Children	P.T. Léger
No. 22:	Some Demographic Consequences of Revising the Definition of Old to Reflect Future Changes in Life Table Probabilities	F.T. Denton B.G. Spencer
No. 23:	Geographic Dimensions of Aging: The Canadian Experience 1991-1996	E.G. Moore D. McGuinness M.A. Pacey M.W. Rosenberg
No. 24:	The Correlation Between Husband's and Wife's Education: Canada, 1971-1996	L. Magee J. Burbidge L. Robb
No. 25:	The Effect of Marginal Tax Rates on Taxable Income: A Panel Study of the 1988 Tax Flattening in Canada	M.-A. Sillamaa M.R. Veall
No. 26:	The Stability of Self Assessed Health Status	T.F. Crossley S. Kennedy
No. 27:	How Do Contribution Limits Affect Contributions to Tax-Preferred Savings Accounts?	K. Milligan

Number	Title	Author(s)
No. 28:	The Life Cycle Model of Consumption and Saving	M. Browning T.F. Crossley
No. 29:	Population Change and the Requirements for Physicians: The Case of Ontario	F.T. Denton A. Gafni B.G. Spencer
No. 30:	Nonparametric Identification of Latent Competing Risks and Roy Duration Models	G. Colby P. Rilstone
No. 31:	Simplified Estimation of Multivariate Duration Models with Unobserved Heterogeneity	G. Colby P. Rilstone
No. 32:	Structural Estimation of Psychiatric Hospital Stays	G. Colby P. Rilstone
No. 33:	Have 401(k)s Raised Household Saving? Evidence from the Health and Retirement Study	G.V. Engelhardt
No. 34:	Health and Residential Mobility in Later Life: A New Analytical Technique to Address an Old Problem	L.M. Hayward
No. 35:	2 ½ Proposals to Save Social Security	D. Fretz M.R. Veall
No. 36:	The Consequences of Caregiving: Does Employment Make a Difference	C.L. Kemp C.J. Rosenthal
No. 37:	Fraud in Ethnocultural Seniors' Communities	P.J.D. Donahue
No. 38:	Social-psychological and Structural Factors Influencing the Experience of Chronic Disease: A Focus on Individuals with Severe Arthritis	P.J. Ballantyne G.A. Hawker D. Radoeva
No. 39:	The Extended Self: Illness Experiences of Older Married Arthritis Sufferers	P.J. Ballantyne G.A. Hawker D. Radoeva
No. 40:	A Comparison of Alternative Methods to Model Endogeneity in Count Models. An Application to the Demand for Health Care and Health Insurance Choice	M. Schellhorn
No. 41:	Wealth Accumulation of US Households: What Do We Learn from the SIPP Data?	V. Hildebrand
No. 42:	Pension Portability and Labour Mobility in the United States. New Evidence from SIPP Data.	V. Andrietti V. Hildebrand
No. 43:	Exploring the Effects of Population Change on the Costs of Physician Services	F.T. Denton A. Gafni B.G. Spencer

Number	Title	Author(s)
No. 44:	Reflexive Planning for Later Life: A Conceptual Model and Evidence from Canada	M.A. Denton S. French A. Gafni A. Joshi C. Rosenthal S. Webb
No. 45:	Time Series Properties and Stochastic Forecasts: Some Econometrics of Mortality from the Canadian Laboratory	F.T. Denton C.H. Feaver B.G. Spencer
No. 46:	Linear Public Goods Experiments: A Meta-Analysis	J. Zelmer
No. 47:	Local Planning for an Aging Population in Ontario: Two Case Studies	L.M. Hayward
No. 48:	Management Experience and Diversity in an Ageing Organisation: A Microsimulation Analysis	T. Wannell M. Gravel
No. 49:	Resilience Indicators of Post Retirement Well-Being	E. Marziali P. Donahue
No. 50:	Continuity or Change? Older People in Three Urban Areas	J. Phillips M. Bernard C. Phillipson J. Ogg
No. 51:	Intracohort Income Status Maintenance: An Analysis of the Later Life Course	S.G. Prus
No. 52:	Tax-Preferred Savings Accounts and Marginal Tax Rates: Evidence on RRSP Participation	K. Milligan
No. 53:	Cohort Survival Analysis is Not Enough: Why Local Planners Need to Know More About the Residential Mobility of the Elderly	L.M. Hayward N.M. Lazarowich
No. 54:	Unemployment and Health: Contextual Level Influences on the Production of Health in Populations	F. Béland S. Birch G. Stoddart
No. 55:	The Timing and Duration of Women's Life Course Events: A Study of Mothers With At Least Two Children	K.M. Kobayashi A. Martin-Matthews C.J. Rosenthal S. Matthews
No. 56:	Age-Gapped and Age-Condensed Lineages: Patterns of Intergenerational Age Structure Among Canadian Families	A. Martin-Matthews K. M. Kobayashi C.L. Rosenthal S.H. Matthews

Number	Title	Author(s)
No. 57:	The Relationship between Age, Socio-Economic Status, and Health among Adult Canadians	S.G. Prus
No. 58:	Measuring Differences in the Effect of Social Resource Factors on the Health of Elderly Canadian Men and Women	S.G. Prus E. Gee
No. 59:	APOCALYPSE NO: Population Aging and the Future of Health Care Systems	R.G. Evans K.M. McGrail S.G. Morgan M.L. Barer C. Hertzman
No. 60:	The Education Premium in Canada and the United States	J.B. Burbidge L. Magee A.L. Robb
No. 61:	Student Enrolment and Faculty Recruitment in Ontario: The Double Cohort, the Baby Boom Echo, and the Aging of University Faculty	B.G. Spencer
No. 62:	The Social and Demographic Contours of Contemporary Grandparenthood: Mapping Patterns in Canada and the United States	C.L. Kemp
No. 63:	Changing Income Inequality and the Elderly in Canada 1991-1996: Provincial Metropolitan and Local Dimensions	E.G. Moore M.A. Pacey
No. 64:	Mid-life Patterns and the Residential Mobility of Older Men	L.M. Hayward
No. 65:	The Retirement Incentive Effects of Canada's Income Security Programs	M. Baker J. Gruber K. Milligan
No. 66:	The Economic Well-Being of Older Women Who Become Divorced or Separated in Mid and Later Life	S. Davies M. Denton
No. 67:	Alternative Pasts, Possible Futures: A "What If" Study of the Effects of Fertility on the Canadian Population and Labour Force	F.T. Denton C.H. Feaver B.G. Spencer
No. 68:	Baby-Boom Aging and Average Living Standards	W. Scarth M. Souare
No. 69:	The Invisible Retirement of Women	L. McDonald
No. 70:	The Impact of Reference Pricing of Cardiovascular Drugs on Health Care Costs and Health Outcomes: Evidence from British Columbia – Volume I: Summary	P.V. Grootendorst L.R. Dolovich A.M. Holbrook A.R. Levy B.J. O'Brien

Number	Title	Author(s)
No. 71:	The Impact of Reference Pricing of Cardiovascular Drugs on Health Care Costs and Health Outcomes: Evidence from British Columbia – Volume II: Technical Report	P.V. Grootendorst L.R. Dolovich A.M. Holbrook A.R. Levy B.J. O'Brien
No. 72:	The Impact of Reference Pricing of Cardiovascular Drugs on Health Care Costs and Health Outcomes: Evidence from British Columbia – Volume III: ACE and CCB Literature Review	L.R. Dolovich A.M. Holbrook M. Woodruff
No. 73:	Do Drug Plans Matter? Effects of Drug Plan Eligibility on Drug Use Among the Elderly, Social Assistance Recipients and the General Population	P. Grootendorst M. Levine
No. 74:	Living Alone and Living with Children: The Living Arrangements of Canadian and Chinese-Canadian Seniors	M.A. Pacey
No. 75:	Student Enrolment and Faculty Recruitment in Ontario: The Double Cohort, the Baby Boom Echo, and the Aging of University Faculty (Revised and updated version of No. 61)	B.G. Spencer
No. 76:	Gender Differences in the Influence of Economic, Lifestyle, and Psychosocial Factors on Later-life Health	S.G. Prus E. Gee
No. 77:	Asking Consumption Questions in General Purpose Surveys	M. Browning T.F. Crossley G. Weber
No. 78:	A Longitudinal Study of the Residential Mobility of the Elderly in Canada	Y. Ostrovsky
No. 79:	Health Care in Rural Communities: Exploring the Development of Informal and Voluntary Care	M.W. Skinner M.W. Rosenberg
No. 80:	Does Cognitive Status Modify the Relationship Between Education and Mortality? Evidence from the Canadian Study of Health and Aging	J.C. Brehaut P. Raina J. Lindsay
No. 81:	Agreement Between Self-Reported and Routinely Collected Health Care Utilisation Data Among Seniors	P. Raina V. Torrance-Rynard M. Wong C. Woodward
No. 82:	Age, Retirement and Expenditure Patterns: An Econometric Study of Older Canadian Households	F.T. Denton D.C. Mountain B.G. Spencer
No. 83:	Understanding the Relationship between Income Status and the Restrictions in Instrumental Activities of Daily Living among Disabled Older Adults	P. Raina M. Wong

Number	Title	Author(s)
No. 84:	Location of Adult Children as an Attraction for Black and White Elderly <i>Return</i> and <i>Onward</i> Migrants in the United States: Application of a Three-level Nested Logit Model with Census Data	K-L. Liaw W.H. Frey
No. 85:	Changing Income Inequality and Immigration in Canada 1980-1995	E.G. Moore M.A. Pacey
No. 86:	The Dynamics of Food Deprivation and Overall Health: Evidence from the Canadian National Population Health Survey	L. McLeod M.R. Veall
No. 87:	Quebec's Lackluster Performance in Interprovincial Migration and Immigration: How, Why, and What Can Be Done?	K-L. Liaw L. Xu M. Qi
No. 88:	Out-of-Pocket Prescription Drug Expenditures and Public Prescription Drug Programs	S. Alan T.F. Crossley P. Grootendorst M.R. Veall
No. 89:	The Wealth and Asset Holdings of U.S.-Born and Foreign-Born Households: Evidence from SIPP Data	D.A. Cobb-Clark V. Hildebrand
No. 90:	Population Aging, Productivity, and Growth in Living Standards	W. Scarth
No. 91:	A Life-course Perspective on the Relationship between Socio-economic Status and Health: Testing the Divergence Hypothesis	S.G. Prus
No. 92:	Immigrant Mental Health and Unemployment	S. Kennedy
No. 93:	The Relationship between Education and Health in Australia and Canada	S. Kennedy
No. 94:	The Transition from Good to Poor Health: An Econometric Study of the Older Population	N.J. Buckley F.T. Denton A.L. Robb B.G. Spencer
No. 95:	Using Structural Equation Modeling to Understand the Role of Informal and Formal Supports on the Well-being of Caregivers of Persons with Dementia	P. Raina C. McIntyre B. Zhu I. McDowell L. Santaguida B. Kristjansson A. Hendricks L.W. Chambers

Number	Title	Author(s)
No. 96:	Helping to Build and Rebuild Secure Lives and Futures: Intergenerational Financial Transfers from Parents to Adult Children and Grandchildren	J. Ploeg L. Campbell M. Denton A. Joshi S. Davies
No. 97:	Geographic Dimensions of Aging in Canada 1991-2001	E.G. Moore M.A. Pacey
No. 98:	Examining the “Healthy Immigrant Effect” in Later Life: Findings from the Canadian Community Health Survey	E.M. Gee K.M. Kobayashi S.G. Prus
No. 99:	The Evolution of High Incomes in Canada, 1920-2000	E. Saez M.R. Veall
No. 100:	Macroeconomic Implications of Population Aging and Public Pensions	M. Souare
No. 101:	How Do Parents Affect the Life Chances of Their Children as Adults? An Idiosyncratic Review	J. Ermisch
No. 102:	Population Change and Economic Growth: The Long-Term Outlook	F.T. Denton B.G. Spencer
No. 103:	Use of Medicines by Community Dwelling Elderly in Ontario	P.J. Ballantyne J.A. Marshman P.J. Clarke J.C. Victor
No. 104:	The Economic Legacy of Divorced and Separated Women in Old Age	L. McDonald A.L. Robb
No. 105:	National Catastrophic Drug Insurance Revisited: Who Would Benefit from Senator Kirby's Recommendations?	T.F. Crossley P.V. Grootendorst M.R. Veall
No. 106:	WAGES in CANADA: SCF, SLID, LFS and the Skill Premium	A.L. Robb L. Magee J.B. Burbidge
No. 107:	A Synthetic Cohort Analysis of Canadian Housing Careers	T.F. Crossley Y. Ostrovsky
No. 108:	The Policy Challenges of Population Ageing	A. Walker
No. 109:	Social Transfers and Income Inequality in Old-age: A Multi- national Perspective	R.L. Brown S.G. Prus

Number	Title	Author(s)
No. 110:	Organizational Change and the Health and Well-Being of Home Care Workers	M. Denton I.U. Zeytinoglu S. Davies
No. 111:	Stasis Amidst Change: Canadian Pension Reform in an Age of Retrenchment	D. Béland J. Myles
No. 112:	Socioeconomic Aspects of Healthy Aging: Estimates Based on Two Major Surveys	N.J. Buckley F.T. Denton A.L. Robb B.G. Spencer
No. 113:	An Invitation to Multivariate Analysis: An Example About the Effect of Educational Attainment on Migration Propensities in Japan	A. Otomo K-L. Liaw
No. 114:	The Politics of Protest Avoidance: Policy Windows, Labor Mobilization, and Pension Reform in France	D. Béland P. Marier
No. 115:	The Impact of Differential Cost Sharing of Non-Steroidal Anti-Inflammatory Agents on the Use and Costs of Analgesic Drugs	P.V. Grootendorst J.K. Marshall A.M. Holbrook L.R. Dolovich B.J. O'Brien A.R. Levy
No. 116:	The Wealth of Mexican Americans	D.A. Cobb-Clark V. Hildebrand
No. 117:	Precautionary Wealth and Portfolio Allocation: Evidence from Canadian Microdata	S. Alan
No. 118:	Financial Planning for Later Life: Subjective Understandings of Catalysts and Constraints	C.L. Kemp C.J. Rosenthal M. Denton
No. 119:	The Effect of Health Changes and Long-term Health on the Work Activity of Older Canadians	D. Wing Han Au T.F. Crossley M. Schellhorn
No. 120:	Pension Reform and Financial Investment in the United States and Canada	D. Béland
No. 121:	Exploring the Returns to Scale in Food Preparation (Baking Penny Buns at Home)	T.F. Crossley Y. Lu